



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/461,984	12/15/1999	JIN LU	PHA-23-890	4517

24737 7590 12/21/2004

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2136

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/461,984

Applicant(s)

LU ET AL.

Examiner

Brandon Hoffman

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are pending in this office action, claim 18 is newly added.
2. Applicant's arguments, filed August 6, 2004, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,799,081) in view of Zhang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,550,008), and further in view of International Telecommunication Union, hereinafter referred to as ITU-T.

Regarding claim 1, Kim et al. teaches a system for copy protecting information, the system comprising:

- A point of deployment module (fig. 4, ref. num 22); and
- A set-top box including (fig. 4, ref. num 20);

- Wherein the set-top box transmits a request message for information (fig. 21, host device transfers EMM, ECM, and CPTC to smart card),
- The point of deployment module generates a reply message (fig. 21, smart card responds by sending CW),
- The reply message including at least one control information pair,
 - Each pair having copy control information and a stream identifier (col. 18, lines 46-48) and
- Generating a first key in the point of deployment module, using the at least one control information pair (fig. 21, CW created in deployment module from EMM, ECM, and CPTC).

Kim et al. does not specifically teach the control information pair includes a stream identifier, generating a second key in the set-top box, the point of deployment module encrypting the information with the first shared key and transmitting the encrypted information to the set-top box, and the set-top box decrypting the encrypted information with the second shared key when the first and second shared keys match.

Zhang et al. teaches generating a second key in the set-top box (col. 10, lines 10-17), the point of deployment module encrypting the information with the first shared key and transmitting the encrypted information to the set-top box (col. 10, lines 22-25), and the set-top box decrypting the encrypted information with the second shared key when the first and second shared keys match (col. 10, lines 25-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine generating a second key in the set-top box, the POD encrypting the information with the first shared key and transmitting the information to the set-top box, and the set-top box decrypting the information when the keys match, as taught by Zhang et al., with the system of Kim et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because shared session keys, used for symmetric key cryptosystems, provide authentication of devices as well as keeping data secure.

Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al. still does not teach the control information pair includes a stream identifier.

ITU-T teaches the control information pair includes a stream identifier (fig. F.7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the control information pair including a stream identifier, as taught by ITU-T, with the system of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because a stream identifier would identify the elementary stream, e.g., data files. This is similar to how ECM contains a content identifier to correctly identify the content in which it refers to. The teachings of Kim et al. use ECM to identify the content, which can be transferred together with the CPTC (see col. 18, lines 61-67 of Kim et al.).

Regarding claim 2, Kim et al. teaches a method of copy protecting information transmitted between a deployment module and a host device, the method comprising the steps of:

- Transmitting a request message for the information from the host device to the deployment module (fig. 21, host device transfers EMM, ECM, and CPTC to smart card);
- Transmitting a reply message from the deployment module to the host device (fig. 21, smart card responds by sending CW),
- Wherein the reply message includes at least one control information pair,
 - Each pair having copy control information and a stream identifier (col. 18, lines 46-48) and;
- Generating a second shared key at the deployment module, using the at least one control information pair and an encryption means (fig. 21, CW created in deployment module from EMM, ECM, and CPTC);
- Decrypting, at the host, the encrypted information (fig. 21, ref. num 263 uses CW to decrypt the information).

Kim et al. does not specifically teach the control information pair includes a stream identifier, encrypting, in the deployment module, the information, transmitting the encrypted information from the deployment module to the host, and receiving the information at the host when the first and second shared keys match.

Zhang et al. teaches generating a second key in the set-top box (col. 10, lines 10-17), the point of deployment module encrypting the information with the first shared key and transmitting the encrypted information to the set-top box (col. 10, lines 22-25), and the set-top box decrypting the encrypted information with the second shared key when the first and second shared keys match (col. 10, lines 25-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine generating a second key in the set-top box, the POD encrypting information with the first shared key and transmitting the information to the set-top box, and the set-top box decrypting the information with the second shared keys when they match, as taught by Zhang et al., with the system of Kim et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because shared session keys, used for symmetric key cryptosystems, provide authentication of devices as well as keeping data secure.

Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al. still does not teach the control information pair includes a stream identifier.

ITU-T teaches the control information pair includes a stream identifier (fig. F.7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the control information pair including a stream identifier, as taught by ITU-T, with the method of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al.

It would have been obvious for such modifications because a stream identifier would identify the elementary stream, e.g., data files. This is similar to how ECM contains a content identifier to correctly identify the content in which it refers to. The teachings of Kim et al. use ECM to identify the content, which can be transferred together with the CPTC (see col. 18, lines 61-67 of Kim et al.).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al./ITU-
I teaches wherein the deployment module is a point of deployment module (see col. 3, line 16 of Zhang et al.).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al./ITU-
I teaches wherein the host is a set-top box (see col. 1, line 28 of Zhang et al.).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al./ITU-
I teaches wherein the encryption means includes a hash function (see col. 10, lines 36-39 of Zhang et al.).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al./ITU-
I teaches wherein the encrypted information in an elementary stream of information is encrypted with the first shared key (see fig. 4, step num 9 of Zhang et al.).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al./ITU-T teaches wherein the stream identifier that is transmitted to the host is incorporated with the Packetized Elementary Stream (PES) header of the elementary stream (see page xi, section intro. 8.1 of ITU-T).

Regarding claim 8, Kim et al. teaches a deployment module for use with a host device, the deployment module comprising:

- Means for communicating with the host device (fig. 4, ref. num 23 and col. 2, lines 54-56); and
- A processor for (fig. 5, ref. num 39 and col. 3, lines 25-27),
 - In response to a request message for information from the host device, generating a reply message to the host device (fig. 21, host device transfers EMM, ECM, and CPTC to smart card in exchange for CW),
- The reply message including at least one control information pair,
 - Each pair having copy control information and a stream identifier (col. 18, lines 46-48),
- Generating a first shared key using the at least one control information pair (fig. 21, CW created in deployment module from EMM, ECM, and CPTC, i.e., the control information pair).

Kim et al. does not specifically teach the control information pair includes a stream identifier, the generating of a first key is for a shared key, and encrypting the

information with the first shared key and transmitting the encrypted information to the host device.

Zhang et al. teaches the generating of a first key is for a shared key (col. 10, lines 10-17), and encrypting the information with the first shared key and transmitting the encrypted information to the host device (col. 10, lines 22-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine generating a first shared key and encrypting the information with the first shared key and transmitting the encrypted information to the host device, as taught by Zhang et al., with the system of Kim et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because shared session keys, used for symmetric key cryptosystems, provide authentication of devices as well as keeping data secure.

Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al. still does not teach the control information pair includes a stream identifier.

ITU-T teaches the control information pair includes a stream identifier (fig. F.7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the control information pair including a stream identifier, as taught by ITU-T, with the module of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al.

Art Unit: 2136

It would have been obvious for such modifications because a stream identifier would identify the elementary stream, e.g., data files. This is similar to how ECM contains a content identifier to correctly identify the content in which it refers to. The teachings of Kim et al. use ECM to identify the content, which can be transferred together with the CPTC (see col. 18, lines 61-67 of Kim et al.).

Regarding claims 9 and 14, the combination of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al./ITU-T teaches wherein the deployment module is selected from the group consisting of a point of deployment module, wireless data interface appliance, smartcard, personal computer, or Internet interface appliance (see col. 3, line 16 of Zhang et al.).

Regarding claims 10 and 15, the combination of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al./ITU-T teaches wherein the host is a set-top box (see col. 1, line 28 of Zhang et al.).

Regarding claims 11 and 16, the combination of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al./ITU-T teaches wherein the encrypted information is transmitted to the host device using a transport stream, wherein the transport stream includes at least one elementary stream (the Examiner believes it to be inherent that the information is transmitted to the host using a transport stream because the information taught by Kim et al. to be

transmitted includes MPEG data (see col. 2, lines 57-59 of Kim et al.), which is well known to be transmitted in a transport stream).

Regarding claims 12 and 17, the combination of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al./ITU-T teaches wherein respective ones of the at least one control information pairs is associated with respective ones of the at least one elementary streams (see Fig. F7 of ITU-T, an elementary stream is associated with control information pairs because each elementary stream requires a stream identifier).

Regarding claim 13, Kim et al. teaches a host device for use with a deployment module (fig. 7), the host device comprising:

- Means for communicating with the deployment module (fig. 4, ref. num 23); and
- A processor for (fig. 4, ref. num 27),
 - Generating a request message for information to the deployment module, and in response, receiving a reply message from the deployment module (fig. 21, host device transfers EMM, ECM, and CPTC to smart card in exchange for CW),
- Wherein the reply message including at least one control information pair,
 - Each pair having copy control information and a stream identifier (col. 18, lines 46-48),
- Decrypting encrypted information, received from the deployment module, with the second shared key (fig. 21, ref. num 263 uses CW to decrypt the information).

Kim et al. does not specifically teach the control information pair includes a stream identifier, generating a second shared key using the at least one control information pair, and receiving the information when the second shared key matches a first shared key generated in the deployment module.

Zhang et al. teaches generating a second key in the set-top box (col. 10, lines 10-17), and receiving the information when the second shared key matches a first shared key generated in the deployment module (col. 10, lines 25-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine generating a second key in the set-top box and receiving the information when the shared keys match, as taught by Zhang et al., with the system of Kim et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because shared session keys, used for symmetric key cryptosystems, provide authentication of devices as well as keeping data secure.

Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al. still does not teach the control information pair includes a stream identifier.

ITU-T teaches the control information pair includes a stream identifier (fig. F.7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the control information pair including a stream identifier, as taught by ITU-T, with the module of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because a stream identifier would identify the elementary stream, e.g., data files. This is similar to how ECM contains a content identifier to correctly identify the content in which it refers to. The teachings of Kim et al. use ECM to identify the content, which can be transferred together with the CPTC (see col. 18, lines 61-67 of Kim et al.).

Regarding claim 18, Kim et al. teaches an article of manufacture comprising a computer readable medium in which resides a computer program, said article being part of a deployment module for use with a host device, said program comprising:

- Instruction means for communicating with the host device (fig. 4, ref. num 23 and col. 2, lines 54-56); and
- Instructions for, in response to a request for information from the host device, generating a reply message to the host device (fig. 21, host device transfers EMM, ECM, and CPTC to smart card in exchange for CW),
- The reply message including at least one control information pair, each pair having copy control information and a stream identifier (col. 18, lines 46-48),
- Generating a first shared key using the at least one control information pair (fig. 21, CW created in deployment module from EMM, ECM, and CPTC, i.e., the control information pair).

Kim et al. does not specifically teach the control information pair includes a stream identifier, the generating of a first key is for a shared key, and encrypting the information with the first shared key and transmitting the encrypted information to the host device.

Zhang et al. teaches the generating of a first key is for a shared key (col. 10, lines 10-17), and encrypting the information with the first shared key and transmitting the encrypted information to the host device (col. 10, lines 22-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine generating a first shared key and encrypting the information with the first shared key and transmitting the encrypted information to the host device, as taught by Zhang et al., with the system of Kim et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because shared session keys, used for symmetric key cryptosystems, provide authentication of devices as well as keeping data secure.

Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al. still does not teach the control information pair includes a stream identifier.

ITU-T teaches the control information pair includes a stream identifier (fig. F.7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the control information pair including a stream identifier, as taught by ITU-T, with the module of Kim et al. as modified by Zhang et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because a stream identifier would identify the elementary stream, e.g., data files. This is similar to how ECM contains a content identifier to correctly identify the content in which it refers to. The teachings of Kim et al. use ECM to identify the content, which can be transferred together with the CPTC (see col. 18, lines 61-67 of Kim et al.).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant add new claim 18.
5. Applicant argues:
 - a. Independent claim 1 is allowable because the “stream identifier” is suggested as being the “control word” of Kim (page 7, third paragraph and page 8, second paragraph).
 - b. Independent claim 1 is allowable because the control word corresponds to the “first key” which is generated from the control information pair. The control information pair corresponds to Kim’s control word and the signal for controlling copy protection (page 7, fourth paragraph).
 - c. Independent claim 1 is allowable because Kim relates the “information” and “control word” as being the same thing; they can’t relate to each other by being the same thing (page 8, first paragraph).

- d. Claims 2, 8, and 13 are allowable for similar reasons to claim 1 (page 8, last paragraph through page 9, first paragraph).
- e. The dependent claims are allowable based on their dependency upon allowable base claims (page 9, second paragraph).

Regarding argument (a), examiner disagrees with applicant. First, examiner referred to ITU-T as having the stream identifier; in this regard, applicant's concern of Kim not showing a stream identifier is moot because examiner agrees Kim does not show this limitation. Second, ITU-T does show a stream identifier as being part of a program stream. A program stream is used for variable length packet structures (where the packets may be relatively large). The information in Kim is video and audio, which as is known in the art are relatively large data. It would stand to reason that the data is transported in a program stream, which inherently contains a stream identifier. This is why it would have been obvious to combine the stream identifier of ITU-T with the system of Kim. Kim deals with copy protection, therefore, copy control information exists. The combination of ITU-T with Kim provides a stream identifier along with copy control information.

Regarding argument (b), examiner disagrees with applicant. Examiner recognized Kim as not showing the stream identifier, with that said, item 4 of the office action only refers to the control information pair as containing a single element, namely the control word. As for the generation of the first key, referring to figure 21 of Kim, the descrambler (263) utilizes the "control word" to descramble the data (col. 18, lines 46-

50). This clearly shows the "control word" as being a first key because a key is used to descramble data; the descrambler (263) uses such key for descrambling.

Regarding argument (c), examiner disagrees with applicant. The "information" of Kim is shown to be digital audio/video that has been scrambled. The "control word" of Kim is used on the "information" to determine if the scrambled information can be descrambled for viewing. Therefore, the "information" and "control word" of Kim are not identical, but yet are related in that a different control word will be sent for differing data depending on the permissions for that data (col. 18, lines 29-42).

Regarding argument (d), examiner disagrees with applicant. See the response to arguments (a) – (c) above.

Regarding argument (e), examiner disagrees with applicant. Based on the arguments set forth by the examiner for arguments (a) – (d), the dependent claims stand as rejected.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2136

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brandon Hoff

BH

E. J. Moore
EIMMOORE@USPTO
12/11/2136